Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 22 2007
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 06-1706

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

GLORIA J. WORDLAW,

Petitioner,

v.

THE CITY OF CHICAGO and
ILLINOIS ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Respondents.

On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals For The Seventh Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

GLORIA J. WORDLAW
2121 East 98th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60617
(773) 978-4544

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, Ordered and Adjudged on February 16, 2007, that Defendant Illinois Attorney General's Office's motion (7) to dismiss is granted. Defendant City of Chicago's Motion motion (9) to dismiss is granted for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The case is dismissed and any pending motion is terminated as moot. Moreover, it is not clear to Gloria Wordlaw why her case was dismissed?

Gloria Wordlaw presented all evidence that the court had ever seen. She also explained how the Res Judicata Law does not apply to her case, how the Eleventh Amendment does not bar all suits against its state in federal courts, and how the state immunities may be considered waived in regard to private damage actions for the purpose of enforcing the Fourteenth Amendment against the state or state officials. She also requested the court to please utilize some of its additional power (jurisdiction) to enforce her rights under the Fourteenth Amendment that will allow Gloria Wordlaw to get paid through the federal courts as if she had a lawyer since Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's office) will not allow her to have a lawyer.

Gloria Wordlaw presented all of the above in her motion dated February 15, 2007, and exhibits filed February 16, 2007, in response to Attorney Kevin Lovellette's motion he requested her to answer to.

Because of the above statements, Gloria Wordlaw presented twelve (12) questions:

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

1. Her rights under the Fourteenth Amendment are being violated. She has not been allowed to have a lawyer in this matter; and is it not true that the worst criminals are allowed to have a lawyer?

2. Misconduct on both lawyers' behalves: Attorney Lammers for the City of Chicago and Attorney Lovellette for the Illinois Attorney General's office filed a motion to appear before Elaine E. Bucklo on January 18, 2007, at 9:15 a.m. to dismiss Gloria Wordlaw's complaint. Neither Attorney Lammers nor Attorney Lovellette showed up for court on January 18, 2007.

3. Judge Elaine E. Bucklo did absolutely nothing about their misconduct and still allowed Attorney Lovellette to continue to file motions and to do as he pleased.

4. Is it not true that Judge Bucklo should have granted Gloria Wordlaw everything Gloria Wordlaw requested in her Complaint for their misconduct?

5. Gloria Wordlaw received a notice (notification of Docket Entry) on January 19, 2007, in the mail from the court stating: response due by February 6, 2007, replies due by February 20, 2007, target date for ruling by mail set for March 14, 2007.

6. On February 21, 2007, Gloria Wordlaw received a notice in the mail stating that a hearing took place on February 16, 2007, and her case was dismissed. Gloria Wordlaw was never notified that a hearing was going to take place on February 16, 2007.

7. It is not clear to Gloria Wordlaw why the court said, "The court does not have any jurisdiction over the City of Chicago, Gloria Wordlaw does not have a claim and her case is less than $75,000.00?" My judgment should be based on the total amount that

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

the state collected for the City of Chicago and the Illinois Attorney General's Office. The state collected $532 million in October and November 2003 as a result of the Attorney General (Lisa M. Madigan) using the information in Gloria Wordlaw's proposal without her permission.

8. The fact that the Attorney General (Lisa M. Madigan) used the information in Wordlaw's proposal without her permission and refused to help Wordlaw violated Wordlaw's rights under the Fourteenth Amendment. The Attorney General (Lisa M. Madigan) was in lawful possession of said property (Wordlaw's proposal) then and there unlawfully converted and disposed of the same to her own use. Based on the above fact, Gloria Wordlaw should be or is entitled to be paid by the State, right?

9. Wordlaw used the Conversion Law to make her claim. If she used the wrong law, please let her know what law can be used for her case. Is there a controlling law for our case? She is trying to get paid from two very powerful Government Entities. If there is no Controlling Law for her case, can the Supreme Court regulate the practice or the rule to be consistent with the federal law as stated in Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 47(b)? As stated earlier, Gloria Wordlaw does not have a written attorney/client agreement with any lawyer at this time. Therefore, can the Supreme Court appoint Gloria Wordlaw a lawyer? It would be deeply appreciated. She would like to start to live a normal life again.

10. The Res Judicata Law does not apply. (See Motion filed by Gloria Wordlaw on February 15, 2007, and exhibited filed February 16, 2007 for more details).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED – Continued

11. Is it not true that it is unlawful for Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's Office) to deprive Gloria Wordlaw from working and destroying her business?

12. Gloria Wordlaw requested the court to please grant the additional relief for PUNITIVE DAMAGES in the sum of $250,000,000.00. She filed the documents for the punitive damages on February 15, 2007, with the motion that was filed on February 15, 2007, and exhibits were also filed for punitive damages on February 20, 2007. The punitive damages do not appear on the computer nor were they filed in a docketing file as documents not scanned. What did they do with the documents for the punitive damages? Gloria Wordlaw is requesting the Supreme Court to please grant the additional relief for the punitive damages in the amount of $250,000,000.00.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF CONTENTS v

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES viii

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 4

FEDERAL JURISDICTION 6

CONCLUSION 7

INDEX TO APPENDICES

United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Order, May 25, 2007 ..... App. 1

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois Statement and attached Judgment in a Civil Case, filed February 16, 2007 ..... App. 3

United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit Order, March 20, 2007 ..... App. 6

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Docket Entries ..... App. 7

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, received February 15, 2007 ..... App. 13

Letter to Martin Green, dated August 7, 2003, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 19

INDEX TO APPENDICES – Continued

Page

Letter to Gloria Wordlaw from Martin Green, dated May 4, 2004, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 21

Illinois Department of Revenue Informational Bulletin, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 22

Letter to Gloria Wordlaw from Mike Klemens, dated September 6, 2006, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 25

Cal-Tax Digest, Article, California Enacts Tax Amnesty Program For Personal, Corporate and Sales Taxpayers, By Chris Micheli, Section (f) .... App. 27

Summary of What Took Place in 1990 and Journal; City Council, Chicago, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 28

United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, Amended Complaint at Law, received February 15, 2007 ... App. 32

United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Notice of Appeal, received March 14, 2007 ..... App. 35

Letter to Mara Georges, dated April 25, 2007 ..... App. 36

Letter to Mara Georges, dated May 10, 2007 ..... App. 38

Letter to T. Rowells, dated May 17, 2007 ..... App. 39

Letter to T. Rowells, dated May 10, 2007 ..... App. 41

Letter to Richard Daley, dated August 15, 2006, received January 26, 2007 ..... App. 43

Letter to T. Rowells, dated August 15, 2006, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 45

Letter to T. Rowells, dated October 23, 2006, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 46

INDEX TO APPENDICES – Continued

Page

Letter to Edward Burke, dated January 10, 2007, received February 16, 2007 ..... App. 48

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, cover letter and attached punitive damages information, received February 20, 2007 ..... App. 49

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Families Unidas v. Briscoe, C.A.5 (Tex.) 1980, 619 F.2d 391 6

Pegues v. Mississippi State Employment Service, C.A.5 (Miss.) 1990, 899 F.2d 1449 6

STATUTES

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... 1, 3

CONSTITUTION

U.S. Const. amend. XI 6

U.S. Const. amend. XIV 1, 2, 6

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

The Order denying Petitioner jurisdiction in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, filed May 25, 2007.

The Judgment in a Civil Case dismissing the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction in the United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, filed February 16, 2007.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

1. The nature of the suit: Civil Rights, under 42 U.S.C. section 1983 Act, 252, 254. (Personal Property) liability.

2. My rights under the Fourteenth Amendment is being violated. I have not been allowed to have a lawyer in this matter.

U.S. Const. amend. XIV

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

3. The attorney General, Lisa M. Madigan violated our right under the Fourteenth Amendment when she used the information in our proposal with out Gloria Wordlaw permission.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. On August 7, 2003, at Chicago Cook County, Illinois Plaintiff Gloria Wordlaw was entitled to immediate possession, of the following described personal property.

In October 1, 2003 to November 17, 2003 the Illinois Attorney General, Lisa Madigan, used the information in our proposal without our permission. Defendant, Attorney Generals office (Lisa M. Madigan) was able to generate or collect $532,000,000.00 through an amnesty program. Moreover, both the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois (Attorney General's office) benefited from the amnesty program as a result of Lisa M. Madigan, Attorney General using our proposal (personal property) without our permission. This is a violation under the Civil Rights Law,

under 42 U.S.C. section 1983 Acts, 252, 254 (personal property) liability.

The kind of relief Gloria Wordlaw is requesting are the following:

A. To be paid at least 10% of what was collected $532,000,000.00. $124,600,000.00 was collected for the city of Chicago, 10%=$12,600,000.00 and $407,200,000.00 was collected for the state of Illinois 10%=$40,720,000.00.

B. We also requested the court to please grant us $250,000,000.00 for punitive damages for the Intentional Emotional Distress that Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers Dan Webb's office have been causing us since 1990, for not allowing us to work or operate our business since 1990.

Also please request that the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois send our checks to the Supreme Court's clerk office please.

2. The United States districts courts northern districts of Illinois, eastern division, ordered and adjudged that defendant Illinois attorney generals office's motion (7) to dismiss is granted. Defendant city of Chicago is motion (9) to dismiss is granted for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly the case is dismissed and any pending motion is terminated as moot. The date above Judgment entered 02/16/2007; and final Judgment entered 02/16/2007.

3. The date Motion by plaintiff, Gloria Wordlaw for reconsideration and submit our evidence that the court has never seen; filed with exhibits 01/17/2007.

4. Motion filed by plaintiff Gloria Wordlaw to enforce jurisdiction filed 02/15/2007.

5. Exhibits filed 02/16/2007 by plaintiff Gloria Wordlaw regarding motion filed 02/15/2007 to enforce 23 (exhibits).

6. Exhibits filed 02/20/2007 by Gloria Wordlaw regarding motion filed 02/15/2007 for punitive damages in the sum of $250,000,000.00 are not shown on the computer nor are they filed in a docket file as (documents not scanned).

7. Notice of appeal filed by plaintiff Gloria Wordlaw on 3/14/2007 regarding order 21, 22.

8. Our case will be dismissed from the court of appeal on April 5, 2007, because we do not have a lawyer.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

1. Gloria Wordlaw is an extraordinary case because Gloria Wordlaw is trying to get paid by two powerful Government Entities. The City of Chicago and the State of Illinois (Attorney General's Office), in which both entities are controlling the State and Federal Courts in the City of Chicago.

It is because of these reasons Gloria Wordlaw feels that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form from any other court; therefore, we decided to bring our case to the Supreme Court to seek Justice!

2. In reviewing all of our documents it will be obvious that there is corruption on both the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois's behalf. And there was no justice on

Gloria Wordlaw's behalf, and there was no justice on Gloria Wordlaw's behalf our case was dismissed, we were not allowed to have a lawyer and we were not compensated.

3. We have not been able to obtain a lawyer for this case due to Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's office) not allowing us to have a lawyer and also not allowing us to work or operate as a business since 1990.

4. When we were in court trying to get our case resolved, it appears that Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb office) were meeting somewhere with a lawyer, who is not our lawyer and the lieutenant Governor. Moreover, if they are using documents, they did not get the documents from us. (Gloria Wordlaw) We do not have a written attorney/client agreement with any lawyer. The city of Chicago is a very, very corrupt city.

5. I was qualified to do the job of assisting the city of Chicago in resolving their tax problems. (See my work experience) the fact that the city refused to pay us nor, did they allow us to continue to work and destroyed our business is a humiliating thing for us to go through. Although, each month some of my family members help pay my bills, I am still at risk of losing my house that I have had for 25 years.

6. Both the city of Chicago and the state of Illinois (Attorney General's office) benefited from our proposal (our property) the city of Chicago will continue to benefit from our proposal because the money from our proposal will continue to generate for the city of Chicago for as long as this city is standing!

FEDERAL JURISDICTION

The "State" for Purposes of the Eleventh Amendment.

The second major issue concerns whether a "state" is being sued. Suit is barred only when the state government is the defendant. Agencies of the state come under this heading, but its political subdivisions do not. Thus suits in federal court against municipal corporations, counties and school boards raise no Eleventh Amendment issue. An entity that is merely the instrumentality of state government shares its immunity, but an entity that is a politically independent unit enjoys no Eleventh Amendment protection.

State's immunities may be considered waived in regard to private damages actions grounded in statutes enacted by Congress pursuant to its power to enact appropriate legislation for the purpose of enforcing the Fourteenth Amendment against the states or state officials. *Families Unidas v. Briscoe*, C.A.5 (Tex.) 1980, 619 F.2d 391. Federal Courts – 266.1

Congress has power under § 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to abrogate state's Eleventh Amendment immunity in order to enforce protections of Fourteenth Amendment. *Pegues v. Mississippi State Employment Service*, C.A.5 (Miss.) 1990, 899 F.2d 1449. Federal Courts – 265

7. We would like to be paid 10% of $407,200,000.00 that was collected for the State of Illinois, which comes to $40,720,000.00 and 10% of $124,600,000.00 that was collected for the city of Chicago, which comes to $12,460,000.00.

8. We would like to be granted additional relief for punitive damages: for Alderman Burke and Dan Webb, not allowing us to work since 1990 and destroying my business. In the sum of $250,000,000.00 (see documents filed for punitive damages filed 02/15/07 and 02/20/07 see copies).

9. We need the Supreme Court to please help us get our case resolve. We would be very, very, grateful if the Supreme Court would make a favorable ruling on our case. We deserve to live a normal life.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, Petitioner respectfully ask that the Supreme Court Grant review of this matter. Gloria Wordlaw would be very, very, grateful if the Supreme Court would make a favorable ruling on our case. We deserve to live a normal life.

Respectfully submitted,

GLORIA WORDLAW
2121 E 98th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60617

Petitioner

United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

May 25, 2007

Before

Hon. William J. Bauer, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. Terence T. Evans, *Circuit Judge*
Hon. Ann Claire Williams, *Circuit Judge*

G. COLLINS WORDLAW, LTD., Plaintiff-Appellant,	Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 07-1595 v.	No. 06 C 7167
CITY OF CHICAGO, a municipal corporation and ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, a municipal State, Defendants-Appellees.	Elaine E. Bucklo, Judge.

ORDER

On March 20, 2007, the court issued an order requiring that an attorney file an appearance on behalf of appellant G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. and a disclosure statement by April 5, 2007. Appellant G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. was reminded that a corporation may only appear and proceed in this court by an attorney. *See Scandia Down Corp. v. Euroquilt, Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1423, 1427 (7th Cir. 1985). Also, appellant G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. was advised that the failure to obtain the services of an attorney to handle this appeal would result in the dismissal of this appeal. To date, no attorney has filed an appearance on behalf of appellant G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. in this matter. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that this appeal is DISMISSED for failure to prosecute.

United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois

(Filed Feb. 16, 2007)

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Elaine E. Bucklo	**Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge**	
CASE NUMBER	06 C 7167	**DATE**	2/16/2007
CASE TITLE	G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. vs. City of Chicago, et al.		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Defendant Illinois Attorney General's Office's motion (7) to dismiss is granted Defendant City of Chicago's motion (9) to dismiss is granted for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, the case is dismissed and any pending motion is terminated as moot.

■ [For further details see text below.] **Notices mailed by Judicial staff. *Mail AO 450 form.**

STATEMENT

Defendant Illinois Attorney General's Office's motion to dismiss is granted. Plaintiff's action is barred by the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution, which prohibits suits in federal courts against state governments. *See Toeller v. Wisconsin Dep't of Corrections*, 461 F.3d 871, 874-75 (7th Cir. 2006). Plaintiff's request that this court allow the suit against the state is denied, for this court does not have the power to do so under the Constitution. *See id.* Defendant City of

Chicago's motion to dismiss is granted for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. In order for this court to have jurisdiction over a civil action there must be diversity of citizenship and an amount in controversy that exceeds $75,000, or a federal question. No diversity of citizenship exists in this case and plaintiff's breach of contract action does not present a federal question, despite plaintiff's claim that this violates the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Mid-American Waste Sys., Inc. v. City of Gary, Indiana*, 49 F.3d 286, 290-91 (7th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, the case is dismissed and any pending motion is terminated as moot.

United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois
Eastern Division

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd

v.

City of Chicago, et al.

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

(Filed Feb. 16, 2007)

Case Number: 06 C 7167

☐ Jury Verdict. This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury rendered its verdict.

■ Decision by Court. This action came to hearing before the Court. The issues have been heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that defendant Illinois Attorney General's Office's motion (7) to dismiss is granted. Defendant City of Chicago's motion (9)

to dismiss is granted for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, the case is dismissed and any pending motion is terminated as moot.

Michael W. Dobbins, Clerk of Court

Dated: 2/16/2007

/s/ Mathew P. John, Deputy Clerk

United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

March 20, 2007

By the Court:

G. COLLINS WORDLAW, LTD., Plaintiff-Appellant,	] Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 07-1595 v.	] No. 06 C 7167
CITY OF CHICAGO, a municipal corporation and ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE, a municipal State, Defendants-Appellees.	] Elaine E. Bucklo, Judge.

ORDER

A review of the short record discloses that appellant is a corporation.

Appellant G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. is reminded that a corporation may only appear and proceed in this court by an attorney. *See Scandia Down Corp. v. Euroquilt, Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1423, 1427 (7th Cir. 1985). Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that an attorney file an appearance and a disclosure statement by April 5, 2007, indicating that the attorney will represent appellant G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. in this appeal. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this appeal.

APPEAL, COLE, TERMED

United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois –
CM/ECF LIVE, Ver. 3.0 (Chicago)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:06-cv-07167
Internal Use Only

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. v. City of Chicago et al
Assigned to: Honorable Elaine E. Bucklo
Demand: $460,000
Case in other Court: 07-01595
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act

Date Filed: 12/28/2006
Date Terminated: 02/16/2007
Jury Demand: None
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. *an Illinois Corporation*	represented by	**G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.** c/o Gloria J. Wordlaw 2121 East 98th Street Chicago, IL 60617 (773) 734-4545 PRO SE

V.

Defendant

City of Chicago *a Municipal Corporation*	represented by	**Michelle M. Lammers** City of Chicago 30 North LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60602 (312) 744-4174 Email: mlammers@cityofchicago.org *ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED*

Defendant

Attorney General's Office *A Municipal State*	represented by	**Kevin R. Lovellette** Illinois Attorney General's Office 100 West Randolph Street 13th Floor Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 814-3720 Email: klovellette@atg.state.il.us *LEAD ATTORNEY* *ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED*

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
12/28/2006	1	COMPLAINT filed by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd., (Exhibits); (hp,) (Entered: 12/29/2006)
12/28/2006	2	CIVIL Cover Sheet (hp,) (Entered: 12/29/2006)
12/28/2006	3	PRO SE Appearance by Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. (hp,) (Entered: 12/29/2006)
12/28/2006	4	(Court only) RECEIPT regarding payment of filing fee paid on 12/28/2006 in the amount of $350.00, receipt number 10645556 (hp,) (Entered: 12/29/2006)
12/28/2006	5	SUMMONS Issued as to Defendants City of Chicago, Attorney General's Office (hp,) (Entered: 12/29/2006)
01/11/2007	6	ATTORNEY Appearance for Defendant Attorney General's Office by Kevin R. Lovellette (Lovellette, Kevin) (Entered: 01/11/2007)

01/11/2007	❍ 7	MOTION by Defendant Attorney General's Office to dismiss (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A-D) (Lovellette, Kevin) (Entered: 01/11/2007)
01/11/2007	❍ 8	NOTICE of Motion by Kevin R. Lovellette for presentment of motion to dismiss 7 before Honorable Elaine E. Bucklo on 1/18/2007 at 09:15 AM. (Lovellette, Kevin) (Entered: 01/11/2007)
01/12/2007	❍ 9	MOTION by Defendant City of Chicago to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Attachments: # 1 Exhibit A # 2 Exhibit B # 3 Exhibit C) (Lammers, Michelle) (Entered: 01/12/2007)
01/12/2007	❍ 10	CERTIFICATE of Service by Defendant City of Chicago regarding MOTION by Defendant City of Chicago to dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint 9 (Attachments: # 1) (Lammers, Michelle) (Entered: 01/12/2007)
01/12/2007	❍ 11	NOTICE of Motion by Michelle M. Lammers for presentment of motion to dismiss 9 before Honorable Elaine E. Bucklo on 1/18/2007 at 09:15 AM. (Lammers, Michelle) (Entered: 01/12/2007)
01/12/2007	❍ 14	SUMMONS Returned Executed by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. as to Attorney General's Office on 12/29/2006, answer due 1/18/2007 (Exhibit). (hp,) (Entered: 01/17/2007)

01/12/2007	❍ 15	SUMMONS Returned Executed by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. as to defendant City of Chicago on 1/2/2007, answer due 1/22/2007 (Exhibit) (hp,) (Entered: 01/17/2007)
01/16/2007	❍ 12	ATTORNEY Appearance for Defendant City of Chicago by Michelle M. Lammers (Lammers, Michelle) (Entered: 01/16/2007)
01/16/2007	❍ 13	MINUTE entry before Judge Elaine E. Bucklo: Set deadlines/hearing as to defendants' motions to dismiss 7 and (9): Responses due by 2/6/2007. Replies due by 2/20/2007. Target date for ruling by mail set for 3/14/07. Mailed notice (mpj,) (Entered: 01/16/2007)
01/17/2007	❍ 16	MOTION by Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. for reconsideration 13 (Exhibits) (hp,) (Entered: 01/19/2007)
01/19/2007	❍ 17	MINUTE entry before Judge Elaine E. Bucklo: Set deadlines/ hearing as to plaintiff's filing captioned Motion (16): Responses due by 2/6/2007. Mailed notice (mpj,) (Entered: 01/19/2007)
01/26/2007	❍ 18	RESPONSE by Defendant Attorney General's Office to motion for reconsideration, motion for relief, 16 (Lovellette, Kevin) (Entered: 01/26/2007)

01/26/2007	❍ 19	NOTICE by Attorney General's Office re Response 18 to *Plaintiff's filing captioned as "Motion"* (Lovellette, Kevin) (Entered: 01/26/2007)
01/26/2007	❍ 20	RESPONSE by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. to Defendant Attorney General's Office motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint 7 (Exhibits) (Document not scanned). (hp,) (Entered: 01/29/2007)
02/15/2007	❍ 23	MOTION by Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. to enforce jurisdiction (Exhibits) (hp,) (Entered: 02/20/2007)
02/16/2007	❍ 21	MINUTE entry before Judge Elaine E. Bucklo: defendant Illinois Attorney General's Office's motion (7) to dismiss is granted. Defendant City of Chicago's motion (9) to dismiss is granted for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Accordingly, the case is dismissed. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is denied as moot. Civil case terminated. Mailed notice (mpj,) (Entered: 02/16/2007)
02/16/2007	❍ 22	ENTERED JUDGMENT Signed by Judge Elaine E. Bucklo on 2/16/2007: Mailed notice (mpj,) (Entered: 02/16/2007)
02/16/2007	❍ 24	EXHIBITS by Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. regarding MOTION by Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. to enforce 23 (Exhibits) (Document not scanned.) (hp,) (Entered: 02/20/2007)

03/14/2007	❍ 25	NOTICE of appeal by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. regarding orders 22, 21; (IFP Pending) (dj,) (Entered: 03/19/2007)
03/14/2007	❍ 26	MOTION by Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. for leave to appeal in forma pauperis and financial affidavit. (dj,) (Entered: 03/19/2007)
03/14/2007	❍ 27	AFFIDAVIT by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. regarding motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis 26 (dj,). (Entered: 03/19/2007)
03/14/2007	❍ 28	CERTIFICATE of Service by G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. regarding notice of appeal 25 (dj,) (Entered: 03/19/2007)
03/19/2007	❍ 29	TRANSMITTED to the 7th Circuit the short record on 3/19/07 notice of appeal 25. Notified counsel (dj,) (Entered: 03/19/2007)
03/19/2007	❍ 30	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT of receipt of short record on appeal regarding notice of appeal 25; USCA Case No. 07-1595 (hp,) (Entered: 03/20/2007)

* * *

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

Plaintiff(s)	**Case No.** 06CV7167
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. An Illinois Corporation	Judge Bucklo
v.	
City Of Chicago and Attorney General A Municipal Corp. A Municipal State	
Defendant(s)	

MOTION

(Received Feb. 15, 2007)

The purpose of this motion is to respond to the Defendant, Illinois Attorney General's Office, Motion to Strike Plaintiff's Motion filed January 17, 2007 and to request this Honorable court to STRIKE Defendant's Motions to dismiss G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.' Complaint, on all counts, 1 through 5 in its January 11, 2007 and all counts 1 through 6 in it January 26, 2007 Motion .

G. Collins Wordlaw, LTD's MOTION to STRIKE and respond to Defendant's filing Captioned "MOTION" which was filed on January 26, 2007.

1. The Plaintiff have filed an Amended Complaint under the Conversion Law to replace Complaint filed January 17, 2007. A copy is included with this motion. (see count II)

2. The Plaintiff has address the issues raised in the Illinois Attorney General's Office Motion to dismiss G. Collins Wordlaw Ltd.'s Complaint and our responses are listed below:

I. THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY

1. In our Motion dated January 26, 2007, number 2 the Plaintiff requested the Defendant, Illinois Attorney General to waive its immunity. We also stated what if, the Attorney General's Office refused to do so, we would request the court to create a Federal cause of actions against the State without their consent to enforce my constitutional Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, that will allow me to be paid through the Federal court.

I. THE ELEVENTH AMENDMENT IMMUNITY

1. Also, as we Stated to you in our January 16, 2007 letter, according to the Eleventh Amendment Acts, it does not bar *all* suits against its State in Federal Courts. A State or some States may choose to give up its immunity to lawsuits under this Amendment. It has done this for example, in enforcing the Fourteenth Amendment.

   The Attorney General's Office violated my Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment when the Attorney General's Office used the information in our proposal without our permission. The Attorney General's Office also refused to help me as a *citizen* when I requested their help to be compensated from the City of Chicago. We also requested their help when alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's Office) to stop them from doing the terrible things to us that they were doing.

2. Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webbs' Office) have been depriving me from having a lawyer since 1989, and nothing was done about it. Again, my Rights as a citizen have been violated under the Fourteenth Amendment.

3. We also wrote the Attorney General's Office about Attorney Rowells being involve in our case without our permission and nothing was done about it. Again, my Rights as a citizen have been violated under the Fourteenth Amendment. We never had a written attorney/client agreement with attorney Rowells.

4. We are requesting this Honorable Court to enforce any Jurisdiction to enforce my constitutional Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, that will allow the court to pay me through the Federal Court.

II. FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM

We have stated our claim under the *CONVERSION LAW*. An Amended Complaint was filed to replace the complaint that was filed with January 17, 2007 Motion. A copy is included with this Motion.

1. We are requesting the court to review and consider the additional *Facts* that the court have never seen:

    1. August 7, 2003 letter to the Attorney General's Office

    2. Informational Bulletin
    indicating how the State went back as far as 1983 to collect the additional taxes that we mentioned in our proposal.

    3. The letter from the State Illinois Department Of Revenue, stating how much money was collected for the City and State

4. The Amnesty Report for 2003
5. Summary Of What took Place in 1990.
6. Letters to Mayor Daley and Lisa Madigan

III. A PRO SE PLAINTIFF MAY NOT REPRESENT A CORORATION

We have not been able to retain a lawyer since 1989 due to alderman Burke and his team of lawyers depriving us from having a lawyer; therefore, again, we are requesting the court to use any jurisdiction to enforce my constitutional Rights under the Fourteenth Admendment, that will allow the court to pay G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.,as if we had a lawyer!

IV. THERE IS NO DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP

My Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment have been violated; therefore, no Diversity is required.

V. CLAIMS ARE BARRED BY RES JUDICATA

Res judicata usually appiles when a conflict arises between the same parties for the same *facts* that was resolved in an earlier case.*

1. The court has never seen any of G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd's *facts*. We G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. filed another lawsuit case no.06CV7167 to request the court to *PLEASE* review and consider all of the facts that the courtnever seen. On the other hand, when a separate and new lawsuit is filed to challenge some aspect of an earlier and separate case, it is called a *COLLATERAL*

* Res Judicata usually applies when a conflict arises between the same parties over the same facts that were resolved in an earlier case.

ATTACK on the earlier case. (see attachment on Collateral Attack).**

2. The court made a decision to allow the earlier case,case no. 06C 1127 to be resolved without giving G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. an opportunity to give the court our *facts* and we were not allowed to have a lawyer (an obvious injustice and unconstitational treatment occurred in the earlier case).

3. We were not aware that an appeal could be taken within 30-days. No one was communicating with us and we did not have a lawyer. The Judge stated that this case could be resolve on a state level under the five-years Statute Of Limitation. The Attorney General's Office to this day February 15, 2007, have failed to pay us!

4. CIVIL LAW In order for a second suit to be dismissed on a motion of re judicata in a civilian jurisdiction, the trial must be identical to the first trial in the following manner: (1) identical parties, (2) identical theories of recovery, and (3) identical demands in both trials. Case no.06CV7167 is not identical to Case no. 06C 1127. (see attachment for civil law)

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, and the reasons stated in the Plaintiff's Motions filed January 17, 2007, January 26, 2007 and February 15, 2007, G.Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. is Begging this Honorable court to Strike both of the Defendant's Motions, on all counts 1 through 6 in its January 26, 2007 Motion and all counts 1 through 5,

---

** When a separate and new lawsuit is filed to challenge some aspect of an earlier and separate case, it is called a collateral attack on the earlier case. This is different than an appeal, which is a challenge to some aspect of a decision made in the same case.

should be Stricken in Defendant's January 11, 2007 Motion.

PLAINTIFF, is requesting judgement against DEFENDANT in the sum of $40,720,000.00 from the Illinois Attorney General's Office and its cost of suit. Your Honor, we are Begging this court to seek JUSTICE in this matter, PLEASE do not let us walk away empty-handed again.

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.

By: /s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw

August 7, 2003

Martin Green
Assistant Attorney General
500 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. vs The City Of Chicago

(Received Feb. 16, 2007)

Dear Your Honor,

Thank you for the help that you gave us, it is deeply appreciated! We are sending you copies of the proof that the city have been using *all* of the information that is outlined in our propcsal. The Director Of Revenue after Patrick Quinn and Edward M. Burke used the information in our proposal (see copies).

Furthermore, I Gloria J. Wordlaw, do not owe the Illinois Department Of Revenue any money. However, when the Illinois Department Of Revenue sent me the notice of liability requesting me to respond and paid $15.30 for interest due for 1992 by December 24, 2002, I had a refund due to me for year 2000, 2001, and 2002. (please see my letters to Mr. Bartolomucci July 18, 2003 and August 4, 2003).

Further, we hope that your office will see a need to further investigate Alderman Ed Burke, he has certainly caused us a great deal of Pain and Suffering. There's no telling what great pain and suffering he has caused others. Ed Burke and the people who have been helping him have destroyed our career as a Tax Consultant, we do not have enough paper to list all the other things they have done.

Again, thank you for all the help that you gave us, it is deeply appreciated!

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.

[SEAL]

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF ILLINOIS

[Addresses and Phone Numbers
Omitted in Printing]

Lisa Madigan
ATTORNEY GENERAL

May 4, 2004

(Received Feb. 16, 2007)

Ms. Gloria Wordlaw
2121 East 98th Street
Chicago, IL 60617

Dear Ms. Wordlaw:

This will acknowledge receipt of your April 8, 2004 correspondence.

As I previously indicated to you in writing, our office is not and will not become involved in your dispute with the City of Chicago. These issues are outside the scope of the Attorney General's Office. Therefore, further communication and dialogue regarding this topic would not be productive. Moreover, I would ask that you cease and desist in representing to either the Mayor and/or collateral interest that our office is somehow involved or poised to intervene on your behalf.

Professionally yours,

/s/ Martin Green

Martin Green
Executive Assistant Attorney General

[SEAL] Illinois Department of Revenue FY 2004-11

Informational Bulletin August 2003

(Received Feb. 16, 2007)

Brian A. Hamer
Director of Revenue

For information or forms . . .

- Call us at: **1 800 732-8866** or **217 782-3336**
- Call our TDD (telecommunications device for the deaf) at: **1 800 544-5304**
- Write us at: Illinois Department of Revenue PO Box 19029 Springfield, IL 62794-9029
- Visit our Web Site at: **www.ILtax.com**
- Call our 24-hour Forms Order Line at: **1 800 356-6302**

The Illinois Tax Delinquency Amnesty Act provides the opportunity for taxpayers to pay outstanding tax liabilities and to have penalties and interest for taxes paid during the amnesty period forgiven.

What are the qualifications for participation in the amnesty program?

To quality for the amnesty program you

- must have a tax liability due for a period or periods ending after June 30, 1983, and prior to July 1, 2002;
- can not be a party to a criminal investigation or have a civil or

What payment options are available?

You may pay the amount you owe by

- electronic funds withdrawal (electronic payment taken from a checking or savings account); or
- cash, check, or money order.

Note: Do not send cash through the mail

When is my payment due?

Your tax payment is due between October 1, 2003, and November 17, 2003.

Where should I send my payment?

Send your check or money order to:

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

criminal litigation pending for any tax collected by the Illinois Department of Revenue; and

- must make full payment of all amnesty tax liabilities during the amnesty payment period of October 1, 2003, through November 17, 2003.

How do I apply for tax amnesty?

No application is necessary to apply for tax amnesty. To participate you simply make full payment of all your amnesty tax liabilities during the amnesty payment period of October 1, 2003 through November 17, 2003.

What are the consequences for not participating in the amnesty program?

The Illinois Tax

PO BOX 19029
SPRINGFIELD IL
62794-9029

If you choose to pay electronically visit our Web site at **www.ILtax.com.**

What if I have not filed returns for periods covered by amnesty?

If you have failed to file or incorrectly reported liability due on previously filed returns, you can now file and pay the tax and penalty and interest will be forgiven.

What liabilities do not quality for amnesty?

Liabilities not covered by amnesty include

- taxes not collected by the department;
- any balance due on returns with periods ending on or before June 30, 1983,

The Illinois Tax Delinquency Amnesty Act proides that penalties and interest charges will be **doubled** if an eligible taxpayer fails to pay his or her tax obligation duing the amnesty period.

and on or after July 1, 2002;

- lien filing and lien release fees;
- bad check penalties; and
- any accepted offer in compromise.

September 6, 2006

Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw LTD
2121 East 98th St.
Chicago, IL 60617

(Received Feb. 16, 2007)

Dear Ms. Wordlaw:

Brian Hamer asked me to respond to your letter of August 30.

Amnesty total collections were	$532 million.
Of that amount $117.6 million was deposited into The income tax refund fund, per state law. The deposits were 11.7 percent of individual income tax collections and 32 percent of business income tax collections.	- $117.6 million
That leaves available to state and local governments	$414.4 million
The various taxes are divided according to different Formulae – but the shares break down:	
State receipts	$289.8 million
Local receipts	$124.6 million
The City of Chicago's share of the local receipts, based on its population and historic collections was. (note – this is city only, not Chicago school's, for example)	$19.1

This reflects Chicago's share of the Individual Income Tax, Use (sales) Tax, and Personal Property Replacement Tax (collected on Business Income Tax Returns) received during amnesty.

I hope this answers your question.

Sincerely

Mike Klemens
217 782-3128

Cal-Tax Digest

A PUBLICATION OF THE CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION

California Enacts Tax Amnesty Program for Personal, Corporate and Sales Taxpayers

by Chris Micheli

* * *

(f) Illinois instituted an amnesty program that collected $532 million in 2003 making it the most successful amnesty program in United States history.

* * *

Summary of What Took Place in 1990

In 1990, the city of Chicago allowed someone to use the information in our proposal to help them collect past due sales taxes and Alderman Burke approved it. (See the attached document with Alderman Burke's signature on it). The person who used information from our proposal suggested that City of Chicago should request the State of Illinois to pass a law for the state to collect the city's outstanding sales taxes.

The person who used the information in our proposal to help collect the city's sales taxes could not have made the decisions that he or she made with out having read the information in our proposal, I, Gloria J. Wordlaw, never gave anyone other than the City of Chicago, a copy of G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd's proposal not even the lawyer who represented us in court. The city of Chicago is only one who had at least four or five copies of our proposal.

Also, the person who used the information in our proposal in 1990, did not fix or correct all of the problems in regards to recovering all of the outstanding sales tax because he or she did not know how to tell the City of Chicago how to collect the additional money that was due to them going back as far as 1983. We G. Collins Wordlaw did mention this in our proposal and could have helped them to collect this additional money that was due to them.

Because the person who used the information in our proposal in 1990, did not fix or correct all of the problems in regards to recovering all of the out standing taxes; the attorney general, Lisa M. Madigan in October, 2003, used the information in our proposal without our permission going back as far as 1983 and made history! Both the City and State benefited a great deal from the $532,000,000.00

that was collected; therefore, G.Collins Wordlaw, Ltd would like to be paid.

JOURNAL – CITY COUNCIL – CHICAGO

4/25/90

(Received Feb. 16, 2007)

* * *

on its behalf, to administer and enforce all provisions of Sections 132-1 and 132-2 without further authorization of the City, its officers, agents or employees.

SECTION 2. Chapter 132 of the Municipal Code of Chicago is hereby amended by repealing Sections 132-43 and 132-44 in their entirety and adding new sections 132-43 and 132-44 to read as follows:

132-43. (a) A tax is hereby imposed upon all persons engaged in the City of Chicago in the business of making sales of service at the rate of 1% of the selling price of all tangible personal property transferred by such servicemen either in the form of tangible property or in the form of real estate as an incident to a sale of service.

(b) The tax by this section shall not be applicable to or imposed upon sales of the following items:

(i) Food for human consumption which is to be consumed off the premises where it is sold, except that alcoholic beverages, soft drinks and food which has been prepared for immediate consumption

shall be subject to the tax imposed hereunder; and

(ii) Prescription and nonprescription medicines, drugs, medical appliances and insulin, urine testing materials, syringes and needles used by diabetics.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to impose a tax upon the privilege of enaging in any business which under the Constitution of the United States, may not be made the subject of taxation by the State of Illinois or any political subdivision thereof.

132-44. Pursuant to the Home Rule Municipal Service Occupation Tax Act, the tax imposed by Section 132-43 of this chapter, and all civil penalties that may be assessed as an incident thereof, shall be collected and enforced by the Department of Revenue of the State of Illinois. The City hereby delegates to the Illinois Department of Revenue, its directors, officers, agents and employees, full power and authority to collect all sums due to the City on its behalf, to administer and enforce all provisions of Sections 132-43 and 132-44 without further authorization of the City, its officers, agents or employees.

SECTION 3. The Municipal Code of Chicago is hereby amended by repealing Chapter 200.6 in its entirety.

SECTION 4. Nothing contained in Sections 1, 2 and 3 of this ordinance shall be construed as abating any action now pending under or by virtue of Chapter 132, Sections 132-1, 132-2, 132-43, 132-44 and Chapter 200.6 herein repealed; or as discontinuing, abating, modifying or altering any tax, interest or penalty accrued or to accrue,

or as affecting the liability of any person or as waiving any right of the city under any provision listed above existing as of August 31, 1990.

SECTION 5. If any provision, clause, sentence or paragraph of this ordinance or the application thereof shall be held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are declared to be severable.

SECTION 6. The City Clerk is hereby directed to file by delivery or certified mail a certified copy of this ordinance with the Director of the Illinois Department of Revenue on or before June 1, 1990.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall take effect on September 1, 1990, except that Section 6 of this ordinance shall take effect upon passage.

---

* * *

Chicago, April 25, 1990.

* * *

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) EDWARD M. BURKE,
Chairman.

In the United States District Court

For The Northern District of Illinois
Eastern Division

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.	)	
An Illinois Corporation	)	
PLAINTIFF	)	
	)	
V.	)	
	)	Case 06CV7167
City of Chicago,	)	JUDGE BUCKLO
A Municipal Corporation	)	MAG. JUDGE COLE
and	)	
Attorney General's Office	)	
A Municipal State	)	
Defendants	)	

AMENDED COMPLAINT AT LAW

(RECEIVED Feb. 15, 2007)

Plaintiff, G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. or Gloria J. Wordlaw an Illinois Corporation, complaining of Defendants, City of Chicago, a Municipal Corporation, and Attorney General's Office, a Municipal State, alleges as follows:

Count 1 CONVERSION

1. On August 7, 2003, at Chicago Cook County, Illinois Plaintiff G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd., an Illinois Corporation, was entitled to immediate possession, of the following described personal property, to wit:

   In October 2003, the Attorney General's Office (The State of Illinois) used the information in our proposal without our permission. The Attorney General's Office requested the Illinois Department of Revenue to have an Amnesty Program, to collect additional taxes due to the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois

going back as far as 1983. We G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. did mention this information in our proposal and we also included this information with our August 7, 2003 letter when we wrote the Attorney General's Office for help. We also included a copy of the *MANDAMUS LAW* explaining how the *MANDAMUS LAW* compels the State to collect the additional taxes that was *still* due to the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. (for more details see August 7, 2003 letter, summary of what took place in 1990, 10/03/06, 10/23/06, 11/16/06, 12/05/06 and 12/15/06, letters)

2. As a result of The Attorney General's Office using the Information in our proposal without our permission, an Amnesty report in 2003 revealed that the State of Illinois instituted an Amnesty Program that allowed the State Of Illinois to collect *$532 Million dollars* in October 1, 2003 through November 17, 2003 making it the Most successful Amnesty Program in the United States history. Both the City Of Chicago Program and the State of Illinois benefitted from this Amnesty Program (see Amnesty report in 2003 and the report that we requested from the Director Of the Illinois Department Of Revenue).

3. Defendant (Attorney General's Office), being in Lawful possession of said property, then and there unlawfully converted and disposed of the same to its own use.

4. Said property was then and there of value to the State Of Illinois (Attorney General's Office) at least $407,200,000.00 to the Defendant and $40,720,000.00 to the Plaintiff, and said property was then and there of value to the City Of Chicago at least $124,600,000.00 to the Defendant and $12,460,000.00 to the Plaintiff.

5. Plaintiff never gave the Defendant (Attorney General's Office) permission to use information in our proposal.

6. By reason of the premises, Plaintiff was damaged in the sum of $40,720,000.00 from the State of Illinois (Attorney General's Office) and $12,460,000.00 from the City of Chicago, no part of which has been paid.

7. WHEREFORE, Plaintiff is requesting judgment against both Defendants in the sum of $40,720,000.00 from the Attorney General's Office and $12,460,000.00 from the City Of Chicago, and its cost of suit.

Count II

INTENTIONAL INFLICTION
OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

We G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. is requesting the court to *PLEASE* allow additional relief to be Granted for PUNITIVE DAMAGES in the sum of $250,000,000.00 for Intentional Infliction Of Emotional Distress from 1990 through 2006. These punitive damages includes depriving me from working, grief, embarrassment, disappointments, violation of the right of privacy and interfering with my mail since 1988 (18-years) (see attachment Part A and Part B – A through P) We are requesting Punitive Damages to be paid by the City Of Chicago Only! Again, we are begging the Court to PLEASE do not allow us to walk away empty handed again.

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.

By: /s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw

2121 East 98th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60617
(773) 978-4544

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

FILE Number 06CV7167

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. An Illinois Corporation PLAINTIFF	)	
v.	)	Notice of Appeal
The City of Chicago A Municipal Corporation and The Illinois Attorney General A Municipal State DEFENDANT(s)	)	(RECEIVED Mar. 14, 2007)

Notice is hereby given that G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd, taking the appeal, Plaintiff v The City Of Chicago and The Illinois Attorney General, Defendants in the above named case, hereby appeal to the United States Court Of APPEALS for the 7th circuit from the final judgment, from Document 21 and 22 filed or entered in this action on the 16th of February, 2007.

G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.

By: /s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Its President

Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.
2121 E. 98th Street
Chicago, IL 60617
(773) 978-4544

April 25, 2007

City of Chicago
Mara S. Georges
Attorney at Law
Department Of Law
Suite 800
30 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602-2580

Re: April 19, 2007 Court Order

Dear Attorney Georges:

It is not clear to us what you and the court want us to do? Why did we receive the enclosed court order? We were told by someone on the 27th floor Appeal Court Office that you and Lisa M. Madigan are not on the 27th floor? We filed the Notice Of Appeal on the 27th floor!

Furthermore, because my Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment have been violated by both The City Of Chicago and The State Of Illinois (Attorney General's Office), we requested the Court to *Please* utilize some of its additional power (Jurisdiction) to enforce my constitutional Rights under the Fourteenth Amendment that will allow G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. to get paid through the Federal Court. Please refer to all of the Motions that we filed in The District Court: 1/17/07, 1/26/07, 2/15/07, and Exhibits filed 2/16/07, and also the Petition that we filed with the Supreme Court on 04/04/07.

We *Still* would like to be paid by both the City Of Chicago and The State Of Illinois Attorney General's Office and also be *Granted Punitive Damages in the sum of* $250,000,000.00 for alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's Office) not allowing us to work or operate our business since 1990. We have proof that Alderman Burke and his team of Lawyers have not allowed us to work, we have the documents that we filed with the court and our 1120's that we filed with the federal (IRS). It is *sad* that the City and State *Still* have not paid us.

Further, we mailed both the City Of Chicago and the State Of Illinois Attorney General's Office a copy of our Petition, a Writ Of Certiorari that we filed with the Supreme Court. see enclosed copies of the green card from the postal service, proof of service. Also, Attorney Rowells is *NOT* our Lawyer!

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw 5/10/07
Gloria J. Wordlaw
President

cc:

Lisa M. Madigan
Attorney General

All Of The Supreme Court Justices

Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.
2121 E. 98th Street
Chicago, IL 60617
(773) 978-4544

May 10, 2007

Mara S. Georges
Attorney at Law
Department Of Law
30 N. LaSalle Street
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s
Payment

Dear Attorney Georges:

We did respond to the April 19, 2007 Court Order. Are you (The City Of Chicago and The State Of Illinois) going to pay us? We need an answer from both of you, because we need to move forward with our case. Also, when will this case be resolve or dismiss. Again, attorney Rowells is *NOT* our lawyer! (see our May 10, 2007 letter to him).

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Gloria J. Wordlaw
President

cc: Lisa M. Madigan
Attorney General
All Of The Supreme Court Justices

May 17, 2007

T. Rowells
Attorney at Law
35 East Wacker Drive
Suite 1870
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s
Lawsuit

Dear Attorney Rowells:

The purpose of this letter is to *enforce* everything we said to you in our May 10, 2007 letter that we wrote to you. As I stated to you, you are *NOT* our lawyer!

As the President of G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. I, Gloria J. Wordlaw, is the only one who can give you permission to be involve in *G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s* lawsuit. We never had a written attorney/client agreement with you, and we don't even *know you*; therefore, you are *NOT* entitled to any money that G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd will recover from this lawsuit. Again, you are *NOT* our Lawyer!

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Gloria J. Wordlaw
President

2121 East 98th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60617
(773) 978-4544

cc: Mara Georges
Attorney At Law
Mayor Daley
Mayor Of Chicago
Lisa M. Madigan
Attorney General
Governor Blagojvich
Governor Of Illinois
All Of The Supreme Court Justices
Others

Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.
2121 E. 98th Street
Chicago, IL 60617
(773) 978-4544

May 10, 2007

T. Rowells
Attorney at Law
35 East Wacker Drive
Suite 1870
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s
Lawsuit

Dear Attorney Rowells:

As we stated to you several times before: You are *NOT* our lawyer! we don't even know you! I, Gloria J. Wordlaw, is the only one who can give you or anyone permission to be involve in *G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s* lawsuit.

Attorney Rowells, you are not making decisions for Gloria J. Wordlaw, you are illegally involve in *G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s* lawsuit without our permission and without *ever* having a written attorney/client agreement with you.

Furthermore, we have responded to the Court Order that the Court sent us. If, you were our lawyer we G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. would not have had to respond to the Court Order. Attorney Rowells, *Please* do not force us to take legal actions against you and whomever is helping you (anyone giving you written documents). Again, you are *NOT* our lawyer and you were *NEVER* our lawyer! Please do not continue to communicate with alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's Office). (See enclosed letters that we wrote you 08/15/06, and 10/23/06)

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Gloria J. Wordlaw
President

cc: Mara Georges
Attorney At Law
Mayor Daley
Lisa M. Madigan
Attorney General
Governor Blagojvich
All Of The Supreme Court Justices
Others

August 15, 2006

Richard M. Daley
Mayor Of Chicago
121 N. LaSalle Street
Suite 500
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.

(RECEIVED Jan. 26, 2007)

Dear Your Honor,

We are communicating with a lawyer regarding this matter. Your honor, we did not give anyone permission to make any decisions for us in this matter.

Furthermore, if attorney Rowells and the Lieutenant Governor are making decisions for us regarding this matter, please request that they stop doing so. Your Honor, what information are they using? Whatever, information they are using they did not get the information from us.

Your Honor, as we stated before, attorney Rowells is *NOT* our lawyer and we did not give anyone permission to make any decisions for us regarding this matter. Your Honor, my lawyer and I will be contacting you with the correct information.

Your Honor, thank you for taking out the time to read our letter.

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw 01/26/07
Gloria J. Wordlaw
Its President

cc:

Robert Grant
Special Agent-In-Charge
Federal Bureau Of Investigation

Others

August 15, 2006

T. Rowells
Attorney at Law
35 East Wacker Drive
Suite 1870
Chicago, Illinois 60601

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s

(RECEIVED Feb. 16, 2007)

Dear Attorney Rowells:

Please do not continue to meet with the city's lawyers in our behalf. You are *NOT* our lawyer!

However, attorney Rowells, you did not do anything to help us get this matter resolve. As a result of us being in federal court and *paying other lawyers* who was *communicating* with us, we were able to get this case where it is today.

Attorney Rowells, is it clear to you now why you are not entitle to any money that we (G. Collins Wordlaw, ltd.) will recover from this matter? Also, we never had a written attorney/client agreement with you. Attorney Rowells, Therefore, we are requesting again that you do not continue to communicate with the city's lawyers in our behalf. Again, you are *NOT* our lawyer!

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Gloria J. Wordlaw
Its President

cc:

Files
Others

Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.
2121 E. 98th Street
Chicago, IL 60617
(773) 978-4544

October 23, 2006

Attorney Rowells
Attorney at Law
35 East Wacker Drive
Suite 1870
Chicago, Illinois 60601

R: Final Notification that you were never our lawyer!

(RECEIVED Feb. 16, 2007)

Dear Attorney Rowells:

This letter is written to notify you that as we have stated over the last ten years or more that you are *NOT* our lawyer! We never had a written attorney/client agreement, and we never gave you any documents to represent us. So, if you are meeting with the city's and the attorney general's lawyers, please do not continue to do so.

We *never* gave you permission to make any decisions for us (G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.) regarding our recent letters to Mayor Daley and Lisa Madigan dated October 3, 2006, requesting payment for G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd. nor, did we give you permission in the past. So, attorney Rowells, whatever, documents you are using, you did not get those documents from us. *We* have done everything, both Mayor Daley and Lisa Madigan have *all* of the information they need to make a decision to pay us. We have also made provisions for someone to get our checks for us. Again, you are *NOT* our lawyer!

In addition, as the President of my Corporation, I can request payment for my Corporation because we are not in court. Attorney Rowells, we have *never* received any letters from you stating that you wanted to help us with this matter. Moreover, we made it clear to you in all of our previous letters to you that you are *NOT* our lawyer! (See all previous letters specially August 15, 2006 letter to you)

Attorney Rowells, once and for all, we hope that it is clear to you as we have stated to you over the past 10-years or more, that there is no need for you to continue to meet with any lawyers in our behalf. Also, whatever documents you have been giving alderman Burke, that is allowing you to be involved in those meetings, those documents are illegal because YOU ARE *NOT* OUR LAWYER!

Sincerely,

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw
Gloria J. Wordlaw
President

cc: Richard M. Daley
Mayor Of Chicago

Lisa Madigan
Attorney General

Alderman Burke

Others

Gloria J. Wordlaw
G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.
2121 E. 98th Street
Chicago, IL 60617
(773) 978-4544

January 10, 2007

Edward M. Burke
Alderman
121 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Re: G. Collins Wordlaw, Ltd.'s
Court Case

(RECEIVED Feb. 16, 2007)

Dear Alderman Burke:

On this day January 10, 2007, we still do not have a written attorney/client agreement with any lawyer at this time. As we stated to Mayor Daley attorney Rowells is not our lawyer. Attorney Rowells was never our lawyer, please do not continue to communicating with attorney Rowells.

Again, do not communicate with any lawyer who do not have a written attorney/client agreement with us. (please see enclosed letters)

Sincerely,

Gloria J. Wordlaw
President

cc: Mayor Daley
Honorable Elaine E. Bucklo
United States Judge
Patrick Collins
United States Attorney
Robert Grant
Special Agent-In-Charge
F.B.I. Department

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

Plaintiff(s)

G. Collins Wordlaw,ltd.
An Illinois Corporation

CaseNo. 06CV 7167

V.

The City Of Chicago and Attorney General
A Municipal Corp. A Municipal State

Defendant(s)

(RECEIVED Feb. 20, 2007)

G. Collins Wordlaw,Ltd. is filing attachments for the Punitive Damages information that was filed on February 15,2007,along with the Motion.

G. Collins Wordlaw,Ltd.

/s/ Gloria J. Wordlaw

INTENTIONAL INFLICTION
OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

PART A

1. G. Collins Wordlaw,Ltd. tried to do the electronic filing portion of our business (filing individual income tax returns) from 1992 through ___ but, someone (the people whose helping Alderman Burke) created false documents (using three of my checks and stamping non-sufficicient funds on it) Bank One/Chase Bank said, "the three checks were never returned to the bank Bank One"

As a result of the people whose helping Alderman Burke creating the false documents (non-sufficient checks) we were not able to do the electronic filing portion of our business. We were damaged in the amount of $140,000. per year. $140,000. times 14 years = $ 1,960,000.00

Alderman Burke is *still* creating false documents see a recent bank deposit from LaSalle Bank dated March 22, 2006. This is a false document because none of the banks we are banking at have a negative balance.

2. I tried to work as a Substitute Teacher from 1995 to 2002. The people whose helping Alderman Burke would not allow me to work enough days that would enable me to pay my bills. Therefore, 4-days times $75.00= $300.00 times 4=$1,200. per month. $1,200. times 10-months= $12,000.

   $12,000.times 11-years $132,000.00in damages for not allowing me to work enough days to pay my bills.

3. Alderman Burke and the city's lawyers have been humiliating us as a business and a person. As a person I was forced to wear dentures that is broken in three places for several years because we were not allowed to work and was not able to take care of my personal needs and pay my bills, etc.

   We came up with a total amount of $247,908,000.00 for being humiliated since 1990.

** We are *NOT* in the business of selling greeting cards.

Total Judgement amount for 1. $1,960,000.00 2. $132,000.00 3. $2,092,000.00 + $247,908,000.00= $250,000,000.00

** As a result of the city destroying our business and not allowing us to work we have bad credit (see credit report).

Documents To Support
Paragraphs (5) and (6)
PART 2

Your Honor, Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's office) are still causing *Intentional Inflictional Of Emotional Distress:*

(1) Depriving us from working (2) Destroyed our business, (3) Grief (4) Shame (5) Embarrassment (6) Disappointment (7) Worry (8) Violation Of the right Of Privacy:

(A) Alderman Burke and his team of lawyers (Dan Webb's office) are *still* interfering with our mail! Since 1988 we have not been receiving all of our mail. Recently, we mailed Mr. Mueller the Director Of F.B.I. a letter and Dan Webb and Alderman Burke told the post office to hold his mail for eight (8) days. Mr. Mueller should have received his mail the next day. We mailed his letter 11/17/06 and he received it 11/27/06, we had the wrong zip code on his letter but, the person who waited on me put the correct zip code on his letter and told me to correct the zip code on my (label) of the certified mail. (see copy) Mr. Mueller should received his letter from us the next day.

(B) In October, 2000, JC Penny's Life Insurance Company canceled my life Insurance because Alderman Burke and Dan Webb requested the post office to hold my mail (payment for my Insurance) for several days until it expired just like they held the Director of the F.B.I.'s mail.

At that time (October, 2000) I was trying to borrow some money from my Insurance Policy. The fact that Dan Webb

have me on the Computer he and Alderman Burke were able to stop JCPenney Life Insurance from giving me any money, because they told the Post Office to hold my October, 2000 payment until it expired. (You see,they did not want me to get any money so that I would not be able to get a lawyer!)

(C) See some of the letters that we wrote Richard A. Devine explaining how Alderman Burke and Dan Webb again, were interfering with my mail. (see 06/28/01 and 07/20/01 letters for more details)

(D) See letters that I wrote to Jack O'Mally States Attorney dated 12/29/1992 and 01/26/1993 for more details requesting help from him because Alderman Burke and Dan Webb were depriving me from working and interfering with our mail.

(E) See false Parking Tickets that Alderman Burke's police friend created for him to make me look bad. These violations never occurred. The policemen were harassing me.

(F) Alderman Burke is still harassing me, he requested one of his policeofficer friend called me on my business phone harassing me about the May 15, 2006 letter (see copy of our May 15, 2006 and May 03, 2006 letters to Alderman Burke.)

(G) False document created by Alderman Burke's friend from the Secretary Of State stating that we did not file an annual report in 1988. (see copy)

(H) Alderman Burke and Dan Webb were using this false document from JP Morgan Chase Bank to make me look bad while they were meeting with attorney Rowells about three (3) weeks ago. This is a false document because the

information on it is not correct. I paid all of my outstanding bills and I never filed Bankrupt.

(I) Alderman Burke and Dan Webb requested the pharmacist or doctors to give me some white pills that no one know what they are and spoiled medicine. It would be deeply appreciated if Alderman Burke and Dan Webb stop requesting the Doctors and Pharmacist to give me medicine that will do harm to me. They are still doing it.

(J) Alderman Burke and Dan Webb have also requested the Doctors and Hospitals to record false information in my medical records.

(K) Alderman Burke and Dan Webb have been interfering with all of my bank accounts since 1989.

(L) Alderman Burke and Dan Webb have been interfering with my telephone service since 1988. They will also request that the phone company turn my phone service off. They would request the phone company to tape some of my phone conversations while they are meeting with attorney Rowells and other lawyers, also, they would request that the phone company would alter the sound so that it would be difficult for me to hear what the person is saying to me or not hear the person at all. Attorney Rowells will go home and get on the phone and talk aboutit to others and laugh about it. *Please* request that Alderman Burke and Dan webb stop interfering with our phone service.

(M) Dan Webb have me set-up on the computer, whenever someone key my name into the computer, there is something on the cumputer that tells the person to do something negative to me or over-charge me for the sevice that they are giving me or the items I am buying. *Please*

stop them from doing this to me. PLEASE take me off the computer.

(N) Dan Webb and Alderman Burke have been requesting the Gas co. (Peoples Energy) to over charge me since 1990. (see copy of recent bills)

(O) Alderman Burke have been communicating with attorney Rowells over ten-years regarding our court case. We Never had a written attorney/client agreement with attorney Rowells nor, did we give attorney Rowells permission to make any decisions for us regarding our October 3, 2006, October 23, 2006, November 16, 2006 and December 5, 2006, letters that we wrote to The City of Chicago and the State Of Illinois/Attorney General's Office. (see some of the many letters that we have written attorney Rowells especially 08/15/06 and 10/23/06 letters to him)